DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 521 EA 004 829

AUTHOR	Campbell, Roald F.; Mazzoni, Tim L., Jr.
TITLE	The Governance of Education: A Progress Report.
PUB DATE	4 Dec 72
NOTE	22p.; Paper presented at "Big Six" annual meeting (Chicago, Illinois, December 4, 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Research; *Governance; Policy; Policy Formation; Politics; Research Methodology; Research Utilization; Socioeconomic Influences; State Action; State Agencies; *State Boards of Education; *State Departments of Education; *State Government

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study of governance at the State level and discusses the usefulness of projected study results. The authors discuss selection of (1) level of governance to be studied, major policy areas, and States for case studies; (2) the selection and development of the research framework; and (3) the development of the survey instruments. According to the report, the study will develop alternative governance models by examining present arrangements for State educational governance. Thirteen States were selected for intensive study as representative of various dimensions within the broad categories of political culture, socioeconomic development, governance structure, and the nature of policy decisions. (JF)

ED 073521

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION: A PROGRESS REPORT

ROALD F. CAMPBELL
TIM L. MAZZONI JR.

We appreciate this opportunity to make a progress report on the educational governance project to the organizations represented in this meeting.[1] As of January, 1972 the U. S. Office of Education approved a project entitled "The Governance of Education: State Structures, Processes, and Relationships." Chief State School Officers Martin Essex of Ohio, Ewald Nyquist of New York, and Jack Nix of Georgia became the Policy Board for the Project. In addition, an Advisory Committee of some eleven members, in and out of education, was established. A contract was let to Ohio State University for the major study of the project and the two of us became the project directors.

The major objective of the project is the development of some alternative models of educational governance. The program is planned for a two and one-half year period. Over the past ten months we have been engaged in a number of tasks. To begin with, we have taken account of other studies of both general governance and educational governance at the state level. In our own work we make some 150 specific references to these related studies.

As a second task, we have developed our own approach to the study of educational governance at the state level. While building upon what others had done, we found it necessary to conceptualize a framework which would seem to contribute most to the purpose of the study; the development of alternative models of educational governance.

---

[1] Paper prepared for annual meeting of the "Big Six", Chicago, December 4, 1972.

EA 004 829

As a third task, we have collected a great deal of information about the governance of education and related matters in all the states. It is clear that we cannot study in depth, within the limits of our time and resources, all 50 states, hence we have been faced with the selection of 12 or 13 states for detailed case studies. To assist in the selection of these states we have collected information about all of the states in four major categories: (1) socio-economic characteristics, particularly wealth and industrialization; (2) the political culture; (3) governance structure, both general and educational; and (4) the nature of policy decision in eight selected policy areas. Further elaboration of state selection and policy areas will be provided below.

As a fourth task we conducted an eight week training seminar for the ten persons who will play major roles in doing the case studies. In order to provide a comparative analysis among states it seemed essential that the same research approach be used in each of the states. To ensure this common format for the studies it seemed necessary that we have a training program for all participants so that they might become thoroughly familiar with the framework. Moreover, it appeared desirable for the entire group to participate in a pilot study where research procedures and survey instruments might be tried and modified as found necessary. We used Ohio for the pilot study.

Currently, our research teams are collecting background data for each of the twelve states where case studies will be done. One or more members of each team has made or will make this month a preliminary visit to each state to confer with major informants about the governance process in the state and to prepare for the more extended visit to the state early in 1973.

Hopefully, what we have said to this point provides some sense of what

the project is about and what has been done to date. We would now like to share with you some of the major decisions we have made. They include the selection of the level of governance, the selection of major policy areas, the selection of states for the case studies, the selection and development of the research framework, and the development of the survey instruments. Finally, we would like to project the study over the next year and one-half and its implementation even beyond that.

Governance At The State Level

We have discovered that the phrase, "governance of education," means many things to different people and brings forth a variety of latent images of what we are about. For some, governance refers to higher education, to others lower education. For some, governance refers to policy making, for others policy implementation. For some, governance suggests the local level, for others the state level, and for still others the national level. Clearly, for any finite project some limitations have to be imposed. We decided to look at the governance of elementary and secondary education and to focus at the state level. This decision leaves out higher education except as it intersects with lower education. It also leaves out local and national governance except as they are related to state governance.

Why the state level focus? A number of reasons prompted this decision. In the first place, we believe that most major policy decisions for education are made at the state level. States have constitutional responsibility to establish and maintain public school systems. Governors, state legislature, state courts, state departments of education, and other state agencies are constantly occupied with the making of policy decisions consonant with that legal mandate. While national policy making for education has become increasingly important over

the last few decades, and while state policy is often affected by national policy, we hold that new models for educational governance can most appropriately be considered by the several states.

Second, as governors and legislators participate in policy making for education, many of them find that educational demands occupy an increasing proportion of their time and require an increasing proportion of the state budget. These political leaders also share some of the disenchantment that many people now experience with respect to our institutions, including our schools. As a result, political actors frequently raise questions about our pattern or model of educational governance. Most chief state school officers have probably heard these expressions of concern. Frequently, such expressions question the protected or autonomous status of education in state government. These questions have been given specific expression in such bodies as the Education Commission of the States. In a recent meeting convened by that body, we heard Governor Askew of Florida express that concern about as follows, "I campaigned on educational issues and now that I am elected I refuse to be kept out of decisions pertaining to education." Askew and others are demanding new models of educational governance.

Third, with growing national influence in education, we think that state influence should be increased to provide an appropriate balance. Indeed, that is what federalism is all about. From the beginning of this nation we thought some balance between state and national influence should be established. In recent years states have seemed derelict in holding up their end of that compact. While we would not deny the importance of national action, we think states must be in the position of influencing and modifying that action. Indeed, local

control, a strong tradition in this country, can probably not be sustained without the protection of state influence. To say it otherwise, we think education will be governed best when there is interdependence among local, state, and national agencies. States need to help preserve that interdependence.

Fourth, most state departments of education recently have recognized the increasing importance of planning, research, and evaluation to their operation. This new emphasis is related to the demand for more resources for education, to the growing concern with accountability in education, and to some disenchantment with our schools, as noted earlier. Most state agencies are not yet very good at these new functions but many attempts, frequently with federal assistance, are being made to become more effective in generating and using information for decision making, whether it has to do with such problems as school district structure or the effectiveness of a particular instructional program.

Finally, recent court decisions, such as Serrano in California and Rodriguez in Texas, portend a role for most states not heretofore conceived. Whether or not the U. S. Supreme Court upholds Rodriguez, many state supreme courts will probably reaffirm the point that their current state school finance programs are unconstitutional. If states go to full or essentially full state funding for the public schools a substantial realignment of resources will be required in most states. Quite frankly, more money will be required for the poor than is now the case. This realignment will not be easy. Before it is achieved governors, legislators, chief state school officers, and many others will be deeply involved. All of this suggests another reason for examining the structures and processes of governance at the state level.

Major Policy Areas

Having decided to focus at the state level, it then became necessary to decide what to look at. Clearly, all policy decisions could not be examined. Nor should only one or a few types of decisions be scrutinized. We then ask ourselves what the critical policy areas were. Our initial formulation included six areas: (1) professional development and certification, (2) desegregation, (3) planning and evaluation, (4) financial support, (5) district reorganization, and (6) teacher bargaining. In our first meeting with the Policy Board two additional areas, curriculum reform and non-public school support, were added. We then wondered just how critical these eight policy areas seemed to those who participated in making policy in each of the states.

This concern led us to go to key informants in each of the states. We asked the governor, the chief state school officer, a selected professor, and the heads of teacher organizations in each state to indicate on a five point scale, from +2 to -2, just how critical they judged each of the areas to be. We received responses from 56 percent of the governors, 90 percent of the chief state school officers, 76 percent of the professors, and 63 percent of the teacher organization heads, a total of 143 responses out of a possible 228. In terms of ratings given by all respondents degrees of criticalness are shown in Table 1.

One wonders how desegregation and non-public school support can be so low. We then analyzed our responses for each state. In California desegregation was ranked plus 6 and was exceeded only by financial support at plus 8. In New Hampshire, on the other hand, desegregation ranked minus 6, the least critical of all the areas. In similar fashion, non-public school support ranked a plus 5 in Massachusetts, Ohio, and Washington and a minus 4 in Michigan and

TABLE I

TOTAL RATING VALUES GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS
TO PROPOSED POLICY AREAS

Policy Area	Rating Value
Financial Support	237
Planning and Evaluation	169
Curriculum Reform	122
Teacher Bargaining	108
District Reorganization	93
Professional Development and Certification	90
Desegregation	54
Non-public School Support	45

a minus 3 in Florida and Indiana. Clearly, degree of criticalness varies among states and perhaps varies by time period.

These considerations may argue that we should retain all eight policy areas even though we find some of them less critical in some states at this time. We also suspect that by looking at a variety of policy areas that we will identify a greater number of actors who participate in making policy decisions. For instance, it seems reasonable that teacher organizations would be more active regarding policy making in the certification area and that business groups would be more active in financial support areas.

However, if we are to examine how eight or more policy decisions were made in each of 12 states we have at least 96 decisions to analyze in detail - for each decision how the demands were generated, who the actors were, what compromises were effected, the nature of the enactment, and procedures established for implementation. Such an analysis for 96 decisions seemed to be impossible.

As we continued to think about the matter we decided we would have to reduce the number of areas from eight to three or four. It then seemed to us that one of these areas ought to focus on the policy making system composed essentially of the governor and the legislature. Policy changes in financial support seemed to be the best area for that purpose and had also been ranked most critical in our preliminary survey. We also thought that one of the policy making areas should focus essentially on the state department of education as a policy making system. Even though teacher and administrator certification had not been ranked as a highly critical issue in our preliminary survey, we thought that decisions in the area were important and might typify in many ways the more routine policy decisions which must be made in every state. We then looked for a policy area where the focus was on the courts as policy makers. Deseg-

regation, even though ranked low in our preliminary survey, perhaps because the federal courts more than the state courts were the chief actors, seemed to be the obvious choice. Finally, in the selection of a fourth policy area, we thought it essential to pick an arena in which the state education agency thought it had done its best job in exercising policy leadership. Precise decisions will thus vary among the states but in gross terms we called this the program improvement area. Our contacts with states to this point suggest that in about half of the cases program improvement will refer to attempts to establish evaluation, accountability, or assessment programs.

We would emphasize two points in the selection of these four policy making areas. We can test the extent to which decisions of a different nature, e.g. finance and certification, do involve different sets of actors. We also wish to stress that we are more interested in the processes back of the decisions than we are in the nature of the decisions themselves. Thus, our study is more concerned with how financial support arrangements are decided than in the technical details of those arrangements.

Selection of States

We began early collecting material related to the governance of education for each of the 50 states. For instance, we learned with interest that the chief state school officer in Tennessee is appointed by the governor and is a member of the governor's cabinet. We also noted the recent reorganization of the governor's cabinet in Massachusetts and the inclusion of a secretary of educational affairs in that cabinet. It soon became apparent that we needed a more systematic way of looking at educational governance in each of the states. As part of this consideration, it seemed to us that each of the states might first be viewed in terms of their political culture and socioeconomic development.

Perhaps many differences among states could be explained by differences in these factors alone. If this were true, it then followed that we must have other data about each of the states. We settled on two other categories; governance structure and nature of policy decisions. We spent some time developing dimensions that would permit us to describe states in these four categories: socio-economic characteristics, political culture, governance structure, and nature of policy decisions.

Since this whole exercise was largely for the purpose of assisting us in the selection of states for the detailed case studies, we felt we must do the task as expeditiously as possible. This meant relying on the work of other scholars who had examined states across various dimensions. As many of you have already discovered, any attempt to compare states on any dimension is a most difficult task. With considerable persistence we developed over forty dimensions in the four categories mentioned above. In the socio-economic category we settled for "wealth" and "industrialization", each of which has a number of sub-sets. Political culture was treated as a single dimension, largely the the extent of a reform tradition. We divided governance into general governance and educational governance. Under general governance illustrative dimensions included the "power" of the governor and the "effectiveness" of the legislature. Under educational governance illustrative dimensions included degree of "citizen control" and the "professionalism" of the state department of education. For each of the eight policy areas we developed one or more dimensions. For instance, under financial support the dimensions included "amount", "equity", and "effort"; under planning and evaluation the dimension came to mean "state commitment to planning and evaluation"; and under teacher bargaining the dimension dealt with the continuum of "soft" to "hard" bargaining.

We found, through a correlational analysis in which each of these variables was correlated with each of the other variables, that many of the differences among the states can be explained in terms of their socio-economic or political cultural characteristics. For instance, industrialization and wealth in New Jersey do much to distinguish that state from New Mexico. In like manner, the reform tradition in Minnesota seems to explain in large measure how that state differs from Mississippi. With the socio-economic and political culture variables held constant, through a partial correlational treatment, we then examined the relationships between governmental structural variables and the nature of the policy decisions in each of the states. In terms of our purpose, the building of alternative models of governance, we became much interested in these structural-policy outcome relationships. A summary of the data available to us for this analysis is shown for each of 16 states in Table 2.

As a result of these analyses, we selected 12 states, plus the pilot state of Ohio, as the states where our case studies would seem to have greatest potential for explanatory power. Moreover, in this tentative selection we had a number of pairs of states, alike in many respects but different in some ways of great interest to us. New York and California, Minnesota and Wisconsin, and Florida and Texas are such pairs. However, in this first cut of states we noted that two regions of the country, the plains and the Rocky Mountain area, were not represented. This consideration led us to consider Nebraska and Colorado in place of some states initially selected. Illinois with a long history of no state board of education and the only state with a school problems commission also became an attractive alternate but we left it in that status. Initially, we included Louisiana but we found conditions there very much in a period of

TABLE 2

DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES FOR SELECTED STATES,
GIVEN FOR THE MOST PART IN STATE RANKINGS

	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS			GOVERNANCE VARIABLES								POLICY AREA VARIABLES					
	Industrialization (Composite)	Income Per Capita	Political Culture	Governors' Powers (Composite)	Leg. Effectiveness (Composite)	SBE Selection	CSSO Selection	CSSO Salary	SDE Budget/ School Age Child	SDE/LEA Ratio	% State Support	Eval. & Plan. (Composite)	Collective Barg. (Composite)	Curr. Reform (Composite)	Finance - "Amount"	Finance - "Equity"	Finance - "Effort"
N.York	5	2	6.3	1	2	O[a]	SB[d]	1	11	37	15	13	4	7	2	14	26
Calif.	6	8	6.4	4	1	A[b]	E[c]	8	36	50	28	21	10	3	30	29	45
Mass.	4	9	6.3	10	29	A	SB	16	40	29	44	28	6	35	11	33	37
La.	39	44	1.9	25	33	E	E	24	22	32	6	48	39	45	28	15	10
Tenn.	23	42	1.4	14	26	A	A	26	29	8	19	46	46	33	47	35	38
Fla.	15	27	2.2	47	4	O	E	12	9	21	9	3	30	2	24	13	36
Tex.	19	31	2.8	50	38	E	A	22	46	42	15	29	46	1	29	28	28
Mich.	10	12	7.9	4	8	E	SB	5	47	49	23	27	4	32	13	41	18
Minn.	21	18	8.9	4	10	A	SB	34	42	35	18	33	3	14	15	36	6
Wisc.	14	25	7.9	25	5	-	E	41	31	24	37	22	12	24	14	20	21
Ohio (Pilot)	8	14	4.8	10	16	E	SB	2	45	47	41	20	34	12	32	17	46
Colo.	34	17	8.2	25	28	E	SB	8	24	46	39	2	40	16	19	47	17
Neb.	31	21	6.3	19	9	E	SB	41	34	21	48	26	24	45	44	24	50
Ill.(Alt.)	7	6	6.2	1	3	-	E	16	28	39	29	37	22	8	5	23	31
Ga. (Alt.)	26	34	1.2	31	45	A	E	21	12	18	10	36	38	26	48	11	48
N.J.(Alt.)	1	5	6.0	4	32	A	A	4	27	14	43	16	6	19	4	43	28

[a]Other
[b]Appointed by governor
[c]Elected
[d]Appointed by state board

transition, hence we substituted Georgia, one of our alternates, for Louisiana.

Upon our recommendation, the Policy Board approved our doing case studies in the 13 states shown in Table 2. A number of arguments can be advanced to support this selection:

1. Seven of the ten megastates are included.
2. Most structural variations of major interest are found in these states.
3. Several chief state school officers reportedly active in changing governance arrangements are included.
4. Many of the states experiencing recent court actions are in the list.
5. All major regions of the country are represented.
6. Some clustering of states to facilitate comparative analysis is possible.
7. For most of the states named background data are available.
8. Finally, it seems that ready access to each of the states is possible.

Framework for the Case Study Research

To reiterate, the primary objective of the project is to develop alternative governance models, models that will emphasize a state-level focus. With this in view, our intent is to examine present arrangements for state educational governance, to identify in these arrangements some of the elements of new models, and to provide empirical data relevant to assessing the outcomes that these models are likely to have if adopted. We are organizing the research to answer these basic questions:

1. What have been the major policy demands made recently of educational policy systems. How have these systems responded? Who were the major actors in generating demands and in responding to them? How were these responses made?

2. What differences exist among state education policy systems in respect to selected policy-making dimensions?

3. How much and what kind of difference does governmental structure make for the way that states vary on these policy-making dimensions? Why does structure make this difference?

4. What other factors explain the variations that exist among states on the policy-making dimensions?

5. What mechanisms exist at the state level to ensure the local implementation of education policy decisions? How adequate are these procedures?

In answering question #1, case study teams will be required to ascertain what policy making demands have been made, and what responses, or indeed lack of response, have been made recently in the four issue areas. Documentation reporting these demands and responses will need to be secured. It should be emphasized that our definition of a "policy response" includes action by authorities to maintain the status quo as well as the establishment of new goals and directions. Since there are many more decisions than can be investigated, it has become necessary to select, with the help of appropriate informants, the four policy areas in each state to be the subject of a thorough examination of participants and process.

To get at question #2 and after much thought about how the research could be made most relevant to our model-building efforts, we finally decided upon these steps: (1) to define a comprehensive set of state policy-making characteristics; (2) to gather through case study research information about these characteristics in each of the states to be investigated; (3) and to seek in the case studies other data relevant to explaining the different patterns that states exhibit in respect to policy making. With these data in hand we think we can move to the development of alternative models and to a projection of how proposed models will probably work in practice. As a first step, our tentative characteristics are shown below:

1. 'Interest Participation' - Degree to which diverse individuals and groups are involved in the making of state education policy.

2. 'Influence Concentration' - Degree to which influence is centralized in the making of state education policy.

3. 'Information Utilization' - Degree to which research-based information is generated and used in the making of state education policy.

4. 'Conflict Accommodation' - Degree to which conflicting demands are recognized and reconciled in the making of state education policy.

5. 'Educational Autonomy' - Degree to which professional educators are the source of state education policy.

6. 'Intergovernmental Leverage' - Degree to which the state education policy system initiates and sustains interaction with national and local systems.

7. 'Monetary Support' - Degree to which the state policy system obtains revenues from its environment for the public schools.

8. 'Fiscal Equity' - Degree to which the state policy system redistributes fiscal resources among school districts.

The selection of state policy system characteristics was based on much discussion and advice. Hopefully, these characteristics will be looked upon as being the important ones by a variety of interested parties. The choice of these, as opposed to other characteristics, was judgmental but it should be stressed that we have not attached values to any particular position on the characteristics. Put differently, a state policy system will be described on each of the dimensions in terms of "more" or "less", not as "good" or "bad".

It is one thing to conceptualize a set of characteristics, it is quite another to design research that will produce accurate descriptions and convincing explanations. For some months we have been hard at work in devising data gathering instruments to be employed in the case studies. We have tested these survey instruments in the Ohio pilot and with a number of competent scholars.

We now have workable interview instruments for the governor and his staff, for legislators and their staff members, for state board of education members, for chief state school officers, and for interest group representatives.

As for question #3, we have already obtained some information through correlational analysis used to help select the states. This analysis has been of value in detecting gross relationships involving socioeconomic development, political culture, governmental structure, and the nature of policy decisions. But to collect data that is fully responsive to the question demands that the intensive search which is possible with the case study be combined with the generalizing power of the comparative method.

Although we feel that our basic research strategy must be the comparative case study, there are problems inherent in this method - namely that of many variables with a small number of cases - which somehow must be minimized. More specifically, in order to answer the question, what difference does structure make, it is necessary to take into account the effects of other factors. Despite there being no completely adequate way to do this, we have designed our research so that at least some "controls" can be instituted. For example, our procedure for selecting states involved the choice of pairs of comparable cases. That is, the states in each pair were similar in a number of important attributes (e.g., political culture and socioeconomic development) but dissimilar in respect to structural features (e.g., the separation of educational governance from general governance.)

The last part of question #3, along with question #4, requires that we must seek to explain "why" as well as to describe "what" and "when". Again the problems are many and formidable. Still, we are confident that there are regularities across state policy systems, and that useful generalizations can be made about the factors at work in producing particular patterns of policy-making character-

istics. This is not to deny that there are unique elements of importance in the policy process of each state. But it is to affirm that our principal effort will be to generalize.

To guide our search for explanatory factors we have accepted the utility of a political systems orientation. Simply stated, this orientation posits an interactive model in which demands are converted through the political process into such outputs as policy decisions. We further assume that influence is central to the interaction among system actors; that policy determination is competitive, characerized by individuals and groups seeking to influence each other so as to obtain decision benefits. Drawing, then, upon both systems and distributive theory we have explicated an analytic schema in which the considerations relevant to understanding state education policy making are set forth. Actually, the resulting framework has gone through two revisions.[2] Rather than present the entire framework, we have listed below some of the categories which we think will have explanatory power:

1. Beliefs, attitudes, and values of official actors (e.g., the "saliency" they attach to educational issues.)

2. Recruitment and background characteristics of official actors (e.g., their"career mobility".)

3. Role expectations of official actors (e.g., the "policy role expectations" that CSSO, state board members, legislators, and governors hold for themselves and for each other.)

4. Policy making behavior of official actors (e.g., the "leadership style" of the governor.)

5. Policy-making behavior of interest groups, parties, and social movements (e.g., the "lobbying activity" of state teacher associations.)

---

[2]This schema is delineated in Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr. "Revised Outline of the Framework for the Case Study Approach." Educational Governance Project, The Ohio State University, October 1972. pp. 1-13.

6. Established procedures for making state education policy (e.g., the nature of "routine" in policy-making organization.)

7. Social norms that guide policy making (e.g., the reliance on "expertness" as the basis of education policy.)

8. Linkages to other policy systems (e.g., the process of "emulation and competition" among states.)

9. Political traditions of state education politics (e.g., the strength of the ideal of "localism".)

While we have not explored basic question #4 in full, we turn now to question #5. We are concerned here with the mechanisms at the state level that ensure the implementation of policy. All of us have probably experienced the apparent enactment of new policy only to discover later that everything has remained the same. This may result from failure to appropriate money for a new program, failure to provide any sanctions if the new program is not implemented, or failure to place responsibility for the enforcement of compliance. We are convinced, therefore, that we must not only find out about policy demands and response but if there was a decision determine that it was a real decision.

Some of our advisors have suggested that we ought to follow policy decisions from the state level to the district level and even to the school level. We think this kind of effort would be useful and indeed it could help answer the question of what difference policy decisions make in the actual operation of schools and possibly in the opportunities afforded to the clients of the schools. Much as we are interested in propositions of this kind, we see no way within time and resources available to us by which such extended implementation concerns can be made a part of our major study. Quite possibly some of our research associates will find questions of this kind of sufficient interest to be pursued on an individual basis. We also have preliminary indications from another research

group that they would like to use our states and focus on implementation.

However, as part of our study, we do expect to apply a number of criteria to the adequacy of implementation mechanisms. These include the following: clarity and extent of communication regarding the policy enactment, comprehensiveness of implementation procedures, extent of organizational resources committed to implementation, evidence of compliance and adjustment, and appraisal of degree of implementation by those who participated in the policy enactment.

From Here On

We have tried to share our progress to date with you. We have reviewed the kinds of decisions our study has required. What about the future? We would like to mention the tasks we still see for the project. We would also like to suggest some activities in which you may wish to engage.

The initial proposal for the project described nine tasks or activities to be undertaken roughly in chronological order. We have moved on four of those tasks: the review of related studies, the establishment of a research framework, the selection of states for the case studies, and the selection and training of case study personnel. Background data for each of our states are already in hand. The big task for this coming year is the completion of the case studies. We anticipate that most of the field work will be done during the Winter of 1972 and that the analyses and reporting of the cases will be completed no later than June 1973.

With the case studies in hand, five other tasks remain. The first is the development of governance options. From the case reports, a number of governance options, possible components of more comprehensive models, will be developed by the central staff. Each of the options will be analyzed logically and in

terms of the empirical evidence available.

The next task requires that we formulate and administer a survey embodying the governance options to a number of groups in and out of education. We must determine the degree of acceptance the various options have among educators and non-educators. The central staff, with appropriate help, will perform this function but cooperation will be required from each of the groups whose members are to be included in the survey, including groups represented in the "Big Six." The preparation, administration, and analysis of results will require the period April through September, 1973.

On the basis of all work done to this point, the central staff will devote the period, July through October, 1973 to the development and explication of alternative models of governance. A consultant will be used to help with legal codification of the models, if that level of development seems desirable.

From October through December, 1973 seven to nine regional conferences will be organized and held for the purpose of examining the alternative models. A cross section of persons with interests in education and government will be invited to each of the conferences. Central staff, Policy Board members, and Advisory Committee members will participate in the conferences. In addition, an observer will be used at each of the conferences. Feedback from the conferences will be used in reworking the models.

From January through June, 1974 the central staff will prepare reports on a comparative analysis of the states and on the alternative models. Tentative documents will be reviewed by the Policy Board, the Advisory Committee, and representatives of other appropriate groups. Final reports will be available to the U.S. Office of Education, to all persons who have cooperated in the study, and

and to interested groups.

These activities will probably mark a termination point for the contract now in effect at Ohio State University. However, in planning the project it was anticipated that some money would be reserved to be used for the dissemination of project findings and recommendations. It was thought that some agency with ready access to political and educational leaders in the several states might be given a contract to do such things as: prepare brief popular reports on the alternative models, prepare as needed a number of specialized reports for different audiences in and out of education on the nature and implications of the various models, encourage and perhaps assist many groups in and out of education to use the model formulations as part of the agenda for their annual meetings.

But what about the "Big Six" and members of your organizations? We realize that you were involved in the initial decision to support a study of educational governance. Each of your organizations nominated persons to the Policy Board, for places on the Advisory Committee. The initial meeting of the Advisory Committee was devoted to reactions to the proposed design of the study;and that design was modified in response to those reactions. In particular, our basic research question #5, having to do with implementation of policy, grew, in large part, from advice given at the first Advisory Committee meeting.

The Policy Board has approved another meeting of the Advisory Committee for June, 1973. At that time, we will be in a preliminary report of some of our findings and to seek some additional advice. We also plan to meet with the Advisory Committee in October, 1973 prior to the regional conferences. We hope to have all members of the Advisory Committee participate

in one or more of those conferences where the beginning formulation of the alternative models will be given their first examination by persons in and out of education. After the alternative models are reworked and while we are in the process of formulating our major reports for the project, we suspect still another meeting with the Advisory Committee will be desirable.

At some point, Tim Mazzoni and I will let go. As noted above, other group may continue with the implementation aspect of the project. Even so, what finally comes of this whole effort depends upon you and the many able persons in education who you represent. With you, we think education is at a critical point in our history. With you, we doubt that we will be permitted to continue educational governance at the state level as usual. We fully expect to have some alternatives for educational governance which have been tested empirically and logically and which deserve your attention and the attention of the American people. We believe that with your interest and persistence these alternatives will be tested further in the political realities of each state and such testing can do much to help states understand the state governance of education and to develop more effective arrangements for that governance. We have confidence that the "Big Six" will meet its full responsibility in the reexamination of educational governance.